Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date:	Document: INCITS Ballot 007-06 INCITS 1574-D, Information technology - Geographic Information Framework Data Content Standards.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
FS	Part 3; Introduction	Lines 255-262	ge	Too wishy-washy as to whether this standard defines content or an encoding.	Directly deny any intent to specify an encoding of the defined content.	Accept in Principle – Text has been modified to clarify that this standard defines a standardized content in support of the exchange of elevation data.
FS	Part 3; 1	Lines 277-280	ge	Absolutely incorrect. Collecting data which conforms to this standard is half the picture. This standard must be paired with a particular encoding of the defined content to permit data interchange.	Remove incorrect claims of this standard's utility.	Accept in Principle - Text has been modified to clarify that this standard will help assure the user community a common understanding to the data.
FS	Part 3; ALL		ge	Elevation data is referred to a reference vertical datum and has units. This specification lacks any means of specifying the vertical datum to be applied to the range. The association of units with the numbers is possible by using "Length" as the type of the attribute (in RecordType). However, units alone are not sufficient. Units are not now, nor have they ever been, metadata. An elevation standard which cannot represent units and a datum is in no way ready to be adopted for use.	Utilize the predefined facility for associating a datum and units with coordinates. In this case, the VerticalCRS and its association with DirectPosition.	Accept in Principle - Text will be modified to document linkage and association with SC_CRS.
FS	Part 3; B.12		te	ElevationPointSet redefines the rudimentary functionality of a 3D coverage.	Omit ElevationPointSet. If the function is not reasonably accommodated by the ElevationPointCoverage, then define ElevationPointSet by extension of CV_DiscretePointCoverage, with the restriction that DiscretePointCoverage.CRS.dimensions=3.	Not accepted. Elevation Point Set is required to help accommodate the numerous requirements for elevation point data.
FS	Part 3; B.4.3		te	The value of "axisNames" is not and cannot be open-ended.	Include reference to the axis naming constraints presented in ISO 19111, Section 10.3, Table 18	Not accepted – an inclusive codelist could not document all of the possible relative and absolute axis combinations

Type of comment: **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date:	Document: INCITS Ballot 007-06 INCITS 1574-D, Information technology - Geographic Information Framework Data Content Standards.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
FS	Part 3; B.2.3		te	Using the feature attribute name of the range type to specify the meaning of the attribute values is bad. Failing to specify naming restrictions means that no two sites will encode the same meaning in the same way, and hence is worse.	Produce a CodeList of likely elevation types. Define some way of deterministically associating a value from this CodeList with an arbitrarily named feature attribute in the rangeType.	Not accepted- an inclusive codelist could not document all of the possible elevation surfaces
FS	Part 3; Annex A.	Line 551	ed	ISO 19123 is released now and doesn't need to be referred to as ISO/FDIS 19123.	Change to ISO 19123	Accept
FS	Part 3; Annex B.1.3	Figure B.1	te	The associated metadata is provided as a link to unspecified content. If metadata is to be included, it should utilize 19115, extending 19115 if necessary. Not only does this definition ignore CI_Citation and friends, it ignores "ExternalResource", defined in the base framework package of this specification.	Change metadata attribute of ElevationCollection to a recognizable extension of the metadata schema.	Accept in Principle - The Geospatial One-stop Committee of the whole decided to permit users to use either the FGDC CSDGM or ISO 19115. Until there is a single endorsed metadata standard or extension of that standard (ie the North American Profile) any work to develop extensions should be tabled.
FS	Part 3; Annex B.1		te	ElevationCollection does not inherit from "FeatureCollection" in part zero. Is this intentional (e.g., it is meant to not inherit any of the attributes of FeatureCollection) or is this meant to be an "implicit" inheritance?	Clarify relationship between FeatureCollection and ElevationCollection. Explicitly deny any connection if no connection is intended.	Accept in Principle – Text has been added to document linkage and association to SC_CRS.
FS	Part 3; Annex B.		ge	This application schema should extend the ISO19123 coverage classes and retain the <<Type>> stereotype-- unless the intent really is to specify the implementation. The current expression for many of the types is a "realization" of the 19123 concepts.	Whenever the intent is to specify an abstraction instead of an implementation, retain the <<Type>> stereotype	Not accepted

Type of comment: **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10